# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/1236/14** **Recommendation – Approve**

**Site:** **46 Mill Road Lancing**

**Proposal:** **Single storey extension to south and west elevation with roof terrace above. Resubmission of AWDM/0212/14 with re-positioning of structural glass balustrading on south elevation.**

**Date of site visit:** 26.9.14

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

This application relates to a detached two-storey dwellinghouse of a modern design and style. It occupiers an elevated backland plot, at the rear of properties in Heyshott Close.

The proposal is for a single storey rear flat roof extension with roof terrace, to measure (at max) 3.7 metres in height, 7.2 metres in length, and 6.9 metres in width.

The site is within an outer residential suburb of Lancing, on the foothills of the South Downs.

**Relevant site history**
AWDM/0212/14
Single-storey extension to south and west elevations with roof terrace above
Approved conditionally 02.04.2014

AWDM/1029/14
APPLICATION FOR NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION AWDM/0212/14: AMENDMENT: RESITING OF STAINLESS STEEL HANDRAIL AND STRUCTURAL GLASS GUARDING ON SOUTH ELEVATION 800MM TO SIT ON EDGE OF PARAPET WALL TO CORRESPOND WITH OTHER ELEVATIONS
Refused 15/08/2014

**Consultations**
**Lancing Parish Council:** *Objection*
*Committee objected as it was concerned that as the plot was on high ground the proposal would affect the privacy of neighbouring properties.*

**Representations**
None

**Relevant Planning Policies**
Adur Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

**Planning Assessment**

***Principle***
Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

***Visual amenity***

The building is of a modern design and the proposed extension, including the roof terrace, would be visually integrated with it in terms of form, shape, and exterior materials/finishes.

No visual harm would arise from it, like before. No material change in site or policy circumstance has occurred to determine otherwise.

***Residential amenity***

It is the neighbours to the west and south who are principally impacted upon by this development.

*Neighbour to west*

This neighbour has a shared drive with the application property. There is current mutual overlooking between the windows of this neighbouring building and the application property.

Accordingly, no adverse harm would occur from the roof terrace, and the extension is physically removed - so as to avoid adverse overbearing and overshadowing.

*Neighbours to south*

The application site is on a hill slope, and the host building is elevated above those properties to the south, along Heyshott Close.

The extension itself would be some distance from these neighbouring buildings, so it would not adversely overbear or overshadow despite its elevated position in relation to these neighbours – although, obviously, it would be a readily noticeable feature.

In terms of impact arising from overlooking and loss of privacy, there is a roof terrace to the application property already. This has the potential for allowing for overlooking and views onto neighbours – whatever the condition of the existing vegetation along boundaries.

Given this situation, the acceptability of the impact hinges on the severity of the *additional* overlooking. In this amended proposal, the previously negotiated reduced size of the terrace is no longer proposed. However, even taking account of this, invasively direct views into the private rooms of neighbours would not occur to an extent that would warrant withholding

permission; there is a substantial drop in the level of the land between the application site and the neighbours to the south, so direct window-to-window overlooking would be avoided.

Some of the neighbours to the south have dormers at the rear which would experience some loss of privacy. However these rooms already experience a high severity of overlooking from the existing roof terrace, so the additional amount would not be in itself adversely harmful.

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

**Subject to Conditions:-**

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match existing dwelling

***Informative:***

*The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N**

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 2-10-2014

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 October 2014